

Attorney Docket No.
IBIG1100-2

09/990,954
Customer ID: 42671

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's comments in the Office Action mailed May 3, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Summary of rejections and amendments

Claims 1-25 were pending in the application prior to the Office Action. The Examiner rejected claims 1-25. Claims 1-4 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-25 therefore remain pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Pursuant to a conversation with the Examiner on July 8, 2004, the Applicant understands that the Examiner has reconsidered this rejection and that the rejection will be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,379 ("Vora"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to remove the word "if" from the claim. It is therefore believed by the Applicant that none of the limitations of the claim can be considered optional or conditional. Accordingly, all of the limitations of the claim must be given patentable weight. As previously stated by the Applicant, Vora does not teach all of the limitations of the claim, so the claim is allowable over Vora.

As to claims 2-20, these claims depend from and include all of the limitations of claim 1, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

As to claim 21, Vora does not teach associating access rights for automated business processes with roles in a hierarchical role structure, or enabling members of an organization to access the automated business processes in accordance with their corresponding roles and associated access rights. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable over Vora.

Attorney Docket No.
BIG1100-2

09/990,954
Customer ID: 42671

As to claims 22-23, these claims depend from and include all of the limitations of claim 21, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 21.

As to claim 24, Vora fails to disclose an approval matrix as recited in the claim. Accordingly, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over Vora.


Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all claims pending in the application. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

If any extensions of time are necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. If any fees are inadvertently omitted, or if any additional fees are required, or if any amounts have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3085 of the Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark L. Berrier
Reg. No. 35,066

Dated: 7/14/04

Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier
1250 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building 2, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78746
telephone: 512.329.2656
facsimile: 512-330-1710
mberrier@texasIP.com